



**MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
MICHIGAN STATEWIDE LONGITUDINAL DATA SYSTEM**

Start Date: 2/1/2006

End Date: 1/31/2009

Amount awarded: \$ 3,000,000

Michigan has been collecting isolated snapshots of individual-level data on 1.7 million students three times a year since 2001 using the Single Record Student Database (SRSD). In fall 2002, the Center for Educational Performance and Information (CEPI) issued the first Unique Identification Codes (UICs) for students and has continued to work in partnership with local districts to maintain the UIC data. In the winter of 2005, the Michigan Department of Education used the Unique Identification Codes to begin tracking student assessment results and now has two years of testing data that can be linked longitudinally for the first time.

In spite of such successes, Michigan does not currently have the technical infrastructure to connect students' records with their assessment results because enrollment data exist in a separate system. In addition, the CELT Corporation, in conjunction with the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO), conducted a comprehensive review in 2005 of Michigan's information infrastructure and ability to meet the new federal No Child Left Behind (NCLB) data collection and reporting requirements. The CELT review found the Michigan Department of Education (MDE) and the CEPI in need of "staffing, funding levels, and decision support systems and tools required to support Michigan's LEAs in the realization of the state's educational goals for its students." Using this report as a starting point, Michigan is developing a master plan and procurement process for all of the data management projects to build the infrastructure that will allow the longitudinal linking of data on students (including students' records with their assessment results), personnel, schools and districts, finances, and other data.

In addition to building a longitudinal data infrastructure, Michigan must rewrite the aging SRSD application. SRSD data collection cycles were set to accommodate the need for information relevant to the state school aid payments to districts, and currently do not align with other state and federal reporting requirements. Because of this misalignment, districts are forced to report duplicative data to various source systems at different times throughout the year. It is imperative that the MDE integrate the SRSD and the longitudinal data system simultaneously to achieve essential improvements in data quality. This integration will enable districts to validate their data before submitting in final version.

STUDENT LONGITUDINAL DATA SYSTEM GRANT WORK

In partnership with Minnesota, Wisconsin, and the Wisconsin Center for Education Research (WCER), Michigan proposes to build a comprehensive multi-state longitudinal data system. Our grant proposal leverages inter-agency knowledge as well as the expertise of our Minnesota and Wisconsin partners. With guidance from WCER, Michigan will foster the design of common solutions, increase capacity for data exchange, and create more powerful research tools. Our tri-state strategic plan identifies the five key components necessary to accomplish the long range strategic goals of implementing a data portal, designing a warehouse and creating linked data sets: 1) data analysis and researcher requirements, 2) data access policies, 3) data dictionary, 4) data warehouse, and 5) secure data collection and transport. We have identified cross-state areas of expertise that define responsibilities in these tasks as well as a shared timeline for development and collaboration.

We recognize that there is diversity among the three states' stages of development and areas of emphasis given specific needs. The tenets of Model Driven Architecture (MDA) will drive each of our designs, but Michigan will focus more closely on extending the Unique Identification Code (UIC), vertical integration (e.g., district-to-state and state-to-district), and the data warehouse for linking a variety of data from various source systems. Vertical integration is critical in a state with over 800 reporting entities and a history of local control. Michigan has realized that in order to best help districts to make their own decisions, fulfill data requirements efficiently, and to distribute the financial, resource, and organizational burdens of increasing information management responsibilities, it must take a leading and centralizing role in state education data. The tri-state strategy of Open Architecture will develop systems useful for making critical decisions at all levels while preserving local choice in Michigan.

The tri-state partners plan to disseminate these products via a project Web site and conferences and workshops targeted at educators, educational researchers, and the informational technology community.

OTHER WORK PLANNED

To ensure that the work outlined by this grant proposal will supplement and not supplant other funds used for developing the comprehensive longitudinal data system, CEPI has committed to devoting a portion of its operating budget to the comprehensive multi-agency longitudinal data system outlined in the DSAC report. The state is working with a contractor for work on a master plan and governance structure that will provide a detailed roadmap for the development that will take place over the next several years.

Data governance will be a critical factor in the success of the Michigan grant. We have implemented a three-tiered governance structure for the interagency collaboration that includes a high-level Data Policy Committee, a Data Managers Working Group, and an Implementation Team. These three tiers will work together to achieve the vision of

“collect once, store once and use many.” In addition, Michigan has developed a similar structure for K-12 reporting entities that includes membership on the CEPI Advisory Committee, the Data Development Group, and pilot implementation groups devoted specifically to each Decision Support System project component. The data governance process will ensure that we have horizontal interoperability among state agencies and vertical interoperability from the local to the state and on to the federal levels.